DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 820 SP 010 536

AUTHOR Ladd, Wayne
TITLE The Non-Adult Participation Program in Detroit Public School Athletics, 1928-1931.
PUB DATE 19 Jun 76
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented to the North American Society for Sport History Annual Convention (4th, Eugene, Oregon, June 19, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Athletic Coaches; *Athletics; Behavior Development; *Educational Philosophy; Individual Development; *Self Directed Groups; Social History; Student Participation; *Student Responsibility; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Blanchard (Vaughn); Competition; Michigan (Detroit); Noncoaching Athletic Programs; *Sport Philosophy; Winning

ABSTRACT

During the early decades of the twentieth century, there was a gradual shift from educational sports as a forum for non-risk individual participation to team and coach-centered endeavors where an emphasis on winning existed. That shift reflected social changes in the United States as American society itself became highly structured and organized for efficiency during the 1920's and 1930's. In the 1920's, the Detroit school system, under the direction of Vaughn Blanchard, introduced a program of non-adult participation in athletic events. That is, during an athletic contest, students organized, played, and managed the event. No adult was allowed to participate in any phase of the contest except officiating. The attempt to implement the non-adult rule in Detroit demonstrates the efforts of Blanchard and other reformers to return the control of athletic events to the students. Yet, the idealistic program failed in Detroit after a four-year trial. The general public, players, and especially the coaches were not prepared for such an innovative concept. In this instance, the press played a major role in establishing educational policy. Also detrimental was Blanchard's inability to communicate the rationale for the program to the athletic consumers. Had that plan worked, students would have entered the mainstream of decision-making by controlling their own affairs. This would have indicated that the program of inter-school athletics was not a social agent transmitting the culture surrounding it. Yet the program was rejected, indicating that interscholastic athletics was an agency for the integration of the whole of the culture. (Author)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED129820

THE NON-ADULT PARTICIPATION PROGRAM IN DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOL ATHLETICS, 1928-1931

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Wayne Ladd, Ph.D.

University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Presented to the
North American Society for Sport History
Fourth Annual Convention

Eugene, Oregon

19 June 1976

SP010 536

Many historians who have researched the phenomenon of sport during the period of the 1920's have recounted the escapades of various Golden Age heroes. These recitations of athletic feats have concentrated on the prevailing thrust in athletics and society, often tying the interpretation of the Golden age to some popularized aspect of the Roaring twenties. Within this social and cultural milieu, however, social historians have demonstrated another vital aspect of society. For example, Huthmacher's study of Massachusettes politics and Chambers investigative work on reform during this decade demonstrate a strata of socio-cultural existence below the popularized and often bowdlerized view of this period! In educational sport of the 1920's the non-coaching movement which, in essence, placed athletes in control of their own athletic teams during sport contests is one such example of a countervening thrust in the athletic establishment opposite of the golden Age or Stadium philosophy of sport.[1]

The Emergence of Sports Within the Educational Structure

Sports and games have existed within the cultural milieu of every society. Such activities have served as a means to train the young for survival, socialization or other utilitarian purposes directly related to physical development. Yet, few societies accepted sport performance as fundamental to the total educational process.[2]

The emergence of an English middle class during the nineteenth century created a different rationale for sport participation; however, adherents claimed sport teams represented miniature societies, containing all the elements of human relationship ranging from respect for the individual personality to group self-government. Therefore, even though promoters of sport continued to adhere to a physical basis for participation, they began to place emphasis upon the apprehension of social values such as leadership, sportsmanship and cooperation.[3]

The emergence of sports in the United States followed this pattern established in England even though such development occurred later since citizens in the young nation had been preoccupied with a disruptive Civil War and a migration to the West. Yet, by the final decade of the nineteenth century, persons in the United States as well as in England were joining in team sports activity while participation in formal exercises and gymnastics predominated in other countries.[4]

Even though sports activity had reached unprecedented levels throughout American society in the last decade of the nineteenth century, such growth had occurred outside the framework of institutional education. During that era educators in the United States concentrated on the traditional classical curriculum and opposed admitting sports activities into the formal educational program. Athletics were to occur outside the curriculum where students were to learn sport skills on their own as they would politics, economics and similar subjects. In response to this neglect, there arose a formidable structure of athletic competition beyond the limits of the school authority. By the dawning of the twentieth century such a program had increased to the point that extracurricular sports participation reached chaotic proportions. Yet, this uncontrolled development merely reflected the <u>laissez faire</u> attitude prevalent throughout the nation during this period as exemplified in the political and economic structure.[5]

In order to bring some control to the burgeoning field, educators established state athletic associations and a national federation providing a basis for administrative and faculty management. Yet, in order to make such inclusion acceptable under the umbrella of progressive education, administrators found it necessary to endow institutional sport with instrumental educational qualities. Forced by such circumstances, educators gradually embraced the athletic program on the high school level and encased it within a philosophy

that expanded the objectives of team participation to include character and moral development as well as intellectual and physical development of the students. According to this point of view, athletic competition would provide students with invaluable opportunities for cultivation of self-discipline and the admirable exercises of self-control in the face of intense emotional involvement. Supposedly then, the individual would develop as an educated human being as he related in competition through group interaction. Implicit in such rationalistic arguments was the assumption that institutional athletics contributed directly to the democratic process. Thus, interscholastic athletics settled into the general curriculum with subjects such as civics, economics and sociology in the name of progressive education.[6]

The inclusion of athletics into the mainstream of the educational process reinforced the rapid institutionalization of coaching. Educators concluded that if students were to gain values such as leadership and sportsmanship from athletic participation, these values would have to be taught. Therefore, in the 1920's there emerged a proliferation of coaches and coaching specialists, procured to supervise the efficient management of the teams while assisting players in formulating character values.[7]

Traditionally, however, in England and the United States, the coach had held only a tangential relationship to a team. He had served as an advisor who directed practice organization and acted as a business manager, having little to do with game situations. Yet, when these changes were occurring on the interscholastic level in the United States, the coach became an activist directing his players during practice and game situations. He became the molder of all behavior as the student-athlete became his charge reacting to game events as the coach demanded. Thus, the coach became the new leader who brought cohesion, stability and efficiency to the interscholastic athletic structure. Like his counterpart in business, he was the organizational genius

who could manipulate his team into a winning combination. And like his business counterpart he was responsible to an almighty board who saw that he was replaced if he did not succeed. Perhaps it was this need to succeed and the desire to make sports an acceptable part of the total educational schema that caused coaches and related colleagues to become obsessed with zealously lauding the benefits of their leadership for athletic teams.[8]

Yet, even as coach-directed sports were settling into the educational curriculum, diverse groups within the educational community challenged the progression of interschool athletics from a school yard game to a capitalistic work experience. Reports from the Carnegie Foundation Studies on Athletics and organizations such as the Women's Athletic Committee and the National Amateur Athletic Federation pointed to apparent contradictions between what the coaches said would occur through their efforts and what was actually happening. It was evident to some that this emphasis on business efficiency by coaches was placing more emphasis on winning than on character development. This reaction against managed competition reflected the growing desire in some quarters of returning control of the game to the players. Some progressive educators advocated a retrenchment in educational athletics as they sought to free interschool sports from its dependence upon responsiveness to the machinations of the larger society.[9]

The non-coaching program in interscholastic athletics was launched in the late 1920's and early 1930's during a time of turmoil within the sports realm as well as within society in the United States. That period was an era of national trauma, when political control was switching from Republican to Democrat, when the nation becoming more urban than rural and when unrestrained capitalism was faltering. Within this dynamic social milieu sport programs were changing drastically. The proliferation of sport teams, the expansion in spectator participation, and the extension of media coverage as well as

the emergence of coaching forced the first critical re-examination of institutional sport.

The Growth and Development of Interscholastic Sports in Detroit

In the city of Detroit, expansion of the athletic program in the city schools had begun immediately before the United States had entered the First World War. The Detroit Board of Education reported in 1915 that for the first time in the history of high school athletics in that city, each school had ended the year financially in the black. Furthermore, the number of participants had reached the highest level. Under the able direction of Ethel Perrin, the program developed with an emphasis upon the educational nature of athletic competition.[10]

Although the war delayed expansion of the city's athletic program, by the early 1920's when Loren Post became the Director of Physical Education for the city's schools, institutional competition was burgeoning on all levels including the elementary. By 1922, organized teams competed for city championships in field hockey, basketball, swimming, tennis, golf, skating, and track and field. There was little discrimination according to sex as girls competed in most of the same sports in which boys competed.[11]

The increasing pressure to expand and develop the interscholastic athletic program did not pass unchallenged, however, for as early as 1924 dissatisfaction emerged within the educational structure in Detroit. In that year the Board of Education eliminated inter-school athletics below the seventh grade level and opted for a stronger intramural program.[12] By 1926, when Vaughn Blanchard became assistant to Loren Post as the Supervisor of Athletics, many educators were prepared for the reforms which he was to propose. His move to withdraw the city schools from state and national competition, to limit competition by female students and to implement a policy of non-coaching came as educational

administrators had tired of what they perceived to be evils of over-emphasis.[13] Yet, before investigating the specific program of non-coaching as developed in Detroit by Blanchard, one must first understand the personal background of this innovative physical educator.

The Personal Background of Vaughn Blanchard

Vaughn Blanchard, born and reared in Franklin, New Hampshire, exhibited throughout his life a disposition to Eastern ideas and institutions. From the very beginning sports played a significant role in his life as he participated in football, baseball and track on all levels of school competition. After graduating from Pittsfield High School in 1908 he matriculated at Bates College in Maine where he starred as Maine intercollegiate champion in the high hurdles for three years between 1910 and 1912.[14] In national competition he won the junior low hurdles title in 1911. Then, the spring in which he achieved his bachelor's degree, he received what he described many years later as "his greatest thrill in fifty years of sport," by qualifying for the 1912 Olympics.[15]

When he returned from the Olympics in Stockholm that summer, he accepted a temporary teaching position at the Buffalo YMCA. Yet, before embarking upon his teaching profession, he spent the following year studying at the Springfield College of Physical Education. With that educational background Blanchard charged into his teaching career at Worcester Academy in Massachusetts where he taught French and German and coached the track team. The succeeding year he moved to Phillips Andover Academy where he contributed similar service.[16] The entrance of the United States into the war in 1917 enabled him to broaden his administrative experience when the Army appointed him Athletic Director at Camp Wadsworth in South Carolina. Then, following the war, he accepted a temporary position as track coach for the spring of 1919 at the University of Alabama. Relinquishing that job after one season he returned to New England to become Physical Director for Medford High School in Massachusetts.[17]

Although his motivation for leaving the East is not clear, Blanchard abandoned his home base of New England in 1920 and travelled West to Detroit. There, he accepted a position to teach German and French at Central High School, then changed responsibilities during his first term to coach the track team and teach various health subjects.[18] In 1923, Blanchard moved again, transferring within the Detroit system to Cass High School where he served as track coach and Director of Athletics.[19] Therefore, during the eleven years immediately following his graduation from Bates College in 1912, Blanchard taught, studied or administered in nine different academic settings.

By 1926, he moved again when Loren Post, the Director of Health and Physical Education for the Detroit City School System, selected the young administrator to assist him as Supervisor of High School Athletics.[20] Blanchard's rise within the organization was mercurial and the effect of his thinking and leadership in Detroit far-reaching. The death of Loren Post on January 9, 1929, opened the way for him to advance to the position of Director of Health and Physical Education where he remained for the next twenty-five years.

Blanchard's recognition in the field of physical education spread rapidly throughout the Midwest as he became one of the foremost proponents of progressive education in physical education and athletics.[22] One of his outstanding accomplishments occurred through the years from 1933 through 1945 when he developed and directed an integrated program of health and physical education from kindergarten through graduate school. For besides his responsibilities as director of the health and physical education program for the city's public schools, he supervised the Department of Athletics at Wayne University.[23]

As a capable administrator Blanchard served his dual post in yeoman fashion. Then in 1935, the American Physical Education Association recognized his achievements when it bestowed its honor award for meritorious service upon him.[24] In the meantime, he had continued his graduate work at the University of Michigan where he earned his Master of Science degree in Physical Education in 1936.[25]

He reached the pinnacle of personal recognition, perhaps, when he served as president of the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in 1947-1948. Then in 1954, upon reaching the mandatory retirement age he relinquished his administrative position.[26]

The Non-Coaching Rule

Although the career of Vaughn Blanchard is an interesting one, the focus of this paper centers on his efforts in the late 1920's to cope with what he perceived to be the over-extension of interscholastic athletics into the academic setting. Blanchard fought for and gained limitations on interscholastic competition in such areas as eliminating participation in national tournaments,[27] limiting participation by girls in athletics,[28] and withdrawing the Detroit School League from the Michigan State Athletic Association.[29] Yet, his most far-reaching and controversial proposal was the non-coaching program.

Blanchard proposed the non-coaching rule late in 1927 and ordered that it take effect during the public school league basketball competition that same year. Although one historian has credited Loren Post for initiating the project, it is clear from other sources that Vaughn Blanchard was the guiding force behind it.[30]

As proposed by Blanchard the non-coaching rule contained the following aspects:

1. There shall be no adult interference in a contest other than imposed by the properly assigned officials in conducting the game.

2. The coaches of the two competing teams shall have no communication whatsoever with their teams from the start of the contest to its close.

3. The two coaches of the competing schools shall occupy seats together far enough removed from the seats occupied by the players to obviate any possibility of communication.

4. The team captains shall exercise the sole right to make substitutions and changes in the lineup. Except that in the case of obvious unfitness of a player to remain in the game because of injury, when if the captain does not remove said player, the coach may withdraw him, but not substitute for him.

5. The team captains and the players themselves analyze the game between halves and plan their own offense and defense.

6. Different captains shall be appointed or elected at intervals throughout the season.

7. Any violation of the non-coaching rule will be summarily dealt with by the Athletic Board of Control.[31]

Although one can properly identify Blanchard's innovative efforts in the Midwest, it is difficult to ascertain the uniqueness of the program on the national level. There is some evidence, in fact, that the concept of non-coaching as well as most of his other basic ideas emanated from Eastern sources.

Blanchard's roots lay within a long tradition of Eastern influence. His liberal arts education at Bates College, his participation in the 1912 Olympics, and much of his early work on the East Coast demonstrate his grounding within New England environment. This Eastern environment had provided many of the norms for athletic organization during the first third of the twentieth century. Moreover, one can ascertain a similarity between the proposals offered by Blanchard in Detroit and those offered at the same time by Frederick Rand Rogers in New York State. For example, in regard to proposals to abolish competition in state tournaments, Rogers argued that "championships elevate the score above the game . . . A city championship may be innocuous--the gains may even outweigh the losses, a league championship may do more good than harm, but a state championship among schoolboys always tends to be destructive."[32] Blanchard echoed these words urging that only as "championships are less stressed" could the coach fulfill "his responsibility in meeting the progress of a game as well as during the practice periods preceding it."[33] Both men led their respective areas to withdraw from state and national competition.[34]

Furthermore, the non-coaching rule proposed by Blanchard was very similar to the rules offered by Rogers and adopted by the New York State Basketball Committee in January of 1928, though the New York program at first dealt only with tournament games while the Detroit plan pointed to league competition.[35] Possibly the

ideas for non-coaching developed through mutual inter-relationship since both were active in regional and national professional organizations.[36] Delineating the individual who deserves the credit for originating the proposal, though significant, is not vital to an investigation of the non-coaching program in Detroit. For within that city sources agree that responsibility for its development rested upon Vaughn Blanchard.[37]

On December 5, 1927, Blanchard announced the implementation of the non-coaching rule for the league basketball season that year. Only a month had transpired between the time when he had proposed the program to the athletic council, composed of principals and athletic directors, and when they had accepted it.[38] Such hasty implementation of the program fostered two major problems. Crucial was the lack of sufficient time to conclude any research on the program before implementing it. The committee had authorized one trial of the rule during one practice game. Yet, there is no indication that any intensive research had occurred.[39] And according to some coaches the principals and athletic committee of the administration had thrust the program upon the athletic teams without consulting the coaches.[40] The committee also had not sought the approval of the Board of Education.[41]

But perhaps a greater problem arose when the athletic administration failed to convey to the media or the general public the educational purposes and outcomes desired from such a program. The news articles which appeared about the new program reported only that the players were to coach themselves during the games.[42] This left considerable leeway for speculation which later emerged that the program was failing to teach the students how to play sports. Yet, according to the proponents of the rule, the Detroit athletic council had employed the program to teach values of independent thought and leadership to participants. In other words, the focus of this group of reformers was not on improving the calibre of sports play itself, but rather on inducing values which were indirectly

related to sport participation. Yet, from the point of view of the coach or the person outside the school system this aspect of the program was hardly understood. Nevertheless, there is some indication that the athletic council did attempt to point out their objectives to some students through student seminars.[43]

In January of 1928 the Detroit athletic teams embarked upon the non-coaching program. The press at first treated it as a novelty, and when reporting the games they continually emphasized that the schools were trying the program on an experimental basis.[44] Then, after only two months of play under the non-coaching rule, Harvey Barcus, a sports editor for The Detroit News, unleashed the first public attack against the regulation. Following the city's high school championship game Barcus laced his reporting of the events of the game with caustic statements regarding the efficacy of the program:

> When Hamtramck's lead began to dwindle the team captain, Walter Piekarski, became excited. He screamed instructions to his players across the court and rushed wildly around the floor, unable himself to stem the tide. A leavening hand at this time, that of the coach, might have staved off defeat for Hamtramck.[45]

Yet, this initial detraction did not affect the implementation of the program. Blanchard reported that spring that the new plan of allowing "no adult interference during the progress of inter-school games" had become "a fixed policy." He concluded his report by asserting that the soundness of the educational philosophy back of this plan had been amply proven. "Games have been fully as interesting and the skill displayed has been closely on a par with that of other years when the coach was the moving spirit. There has been noticeable growth among the players in initiative and leadership."[46] In keeping with this positive attitude the athletic committee decided to include football in the non-coaching program for the following year.[47] Moreover, surrounding communities after seeing it in operation began to copy the program and initiate it within their own institutions.[48]

Throughout the following year overt controversy about the program was minimal as it went into operation in both sports. The city's newspapers carried various

news items about high school competition, but made few comments regarding the non-coaching policy. Yet, criticism from the ranks of the coaches was real and was of such intensity that Blanchard published a defense of the program in the American Physical Education Review during 1929. Complicating an understanding of the coaches' feelings about the program was the conflict which existed between many of them and Blanchard. From the time that he had ascended to an administrative position, Blanchard had remained isolated and aloof from the coaches in the schools. His contempt for some of these men surfaced in his article in the Review. "In attempting to refute some of the arguments against this new venture through the medium of this same daily newspaper the futility of it forced itself on me. It was merely my personal opinion and my personal viewpoint against that of two or three coaches who had been interviewed and had a preconceived hatred of the plan as I have had a preconceived conviction that it was fundamentally right."[49]

The following year the seething dissatisfaction with the non-coaching program erupted into public view. Opponents of the plan seized with delight the news that a similar program had failed in one of the most prestigious areas of athletic participation, the Ivy League. In 1930, both Harvard and Yale decided to drop their experiment of non-coaching during baseball games, after the students had demanded a return to "regular" coaching techniques.[50]

By 1931, most coaches, athletic directors and many principals opposed the program. Moreover, coaches had learned to sidestep full implementation of the system by employing auxiliary captains who would relay signals to the team from the coach during the games. Most coaches were highly dissatisfied with the non-coaching rule. Although Blanchard had had his way by taking Detroit out of national competition and by eliminating some of the competitive inter-school programs below the high school level, it was evident that in this situation he was not meeting with success. Whereas in the other programs he had received considerable support from various coaches, the non-coaching rule had no support on the

grass roots level.[51]

Barcus accelerated his barrage of propaganda against Blanchard and the program, climaxing his campaign early in May of 1931 when the Board of Education met to consider the merits of the non-coaching rule. On May 10, Barcus swung out at Blanchard in striking headlines in The Detroit News. The aggressive sports-writer had conducted a secret survey among coaches and players which produced devastating results. Out of 104 athletic directors, coaches and players in the Detroit School League who responded to his poll, seventy-seven per cent urged immediate repeal of the non-coaching program, while another ten per cent suggested that it needed modification.[52] Such a report did much to counteract the statistics which Blanchard had used since 1929 when he had published his data in the American Physical Education Review suggesting wide support for the program, especially among players.[53]

The next issue of the News again carried a stern editorial denouncing the program.[54] Thus, when the Board of Education met on May 12, the decision was never in doubt as the members unanimously voted to rescind the non-coaching rule. Although the Board had never approved the program officially, since Blanchard had implemented it through administrative fiat, the opposition forces had sough authoritative means to strike it from the athletic department's guidelines.[55]

Barcus was exultant the following day as once more he decried the non-coaching plan in headlines. Quoting one board member's recommendation to cancel the program, the newspaperman reported, "The rule . . . has been given a fair trial. It has unquestionably been a failure."[56]

The Detroit Free Press which had previously remained aloof from the argument over the program was similarly unrestrained as it reported that the "action of the board will be greeted with enthusiasm by coaches and players alike." The paper also noted the deep resentment which had accrued against the proposal by pointing out that the decision was unanimous and that "included in the motion was the request that the new ruling stand for six years."[57]

Thus, the non-coaching experiment in Detroit came to a decisive end on May 12, 1931. Although Blanchard had become embittered over the conflict between himself and opposing forces, he turned to other matters of academic interest in physical education. After that point, there is no mention of the non-coaching idea in any of his writings or speeches even though the intent of the concept lived on in his efforts to make the student responsible for his own learning in various other academic situations.[58]

Conclusion

During the early decades of this century there was a dramatic shift in policy from educational sports as a forum for non-risk individual participation to team and coach centered endeavors where an emphasis on winning existed. That shift merely reflected an identical transition in the socialization of citizens in the United States. For with the end of American innocence in a social and political sense, society itself became much more structured and organized for efficiency during the 1920's and 1930's.

The attempt to implement the non-coaching rule in Detroit in the late 1920's demonstrates the efforts of certain reformers to counter that structure and turn athletic events back to the students. The program failed in Detroit because the public at large, the players, and especially the coaches were not prepared for such an innovative concept. Also detrimental was Blanchard's inability to communicate to the athletic consumers the rationale and means for implementing the program. In this instance the press played a major role in establishing educational policy. Had that plan worked so that students would have entered the mainstream of decision-making by controlling their own affairs, the opposite of what was taking place in the wider culture, it would have indicated that the program of inter-school athletics was not a social agent transmitting cultural values, but was actually averse to much of the business-oriented culture surrounding it. Yet, the program was rejected, indicating in this instance, that interscholastic athletics was not an institution in and of itself but an integration of the whole of the culture.

Footnotes

[1]Often when examining the changes engendered in American society historians place great emphasis upon the Rooseveltian era. Although that analysis has merit, perhaps a more precise description is given by those who have probed the antecedents of changes that occurred in the 1930's. Helpful is Joseph Huthmacher's incisive study of Massachusetts People and Politics, 1919-1933 (Cambridge, 1959) and Clarke Chambers, Seedtime of Reform (Minneapolis, 1963). For an examination of the precedents for these changes in physical education and sport see Frederick Rand Rogers, The Future of Interscholastic Athletics (New York, 1929).

[2]For an examination of such historical precedents see Ellen Gerber, Innovators and Institutions in Physical Education (Philadelphia, 1971), "Introduction"; Deobold VanDalen and Bruce Bennett, World History of Physical Education (Englewood Cliffs, 1971), 3-187; Delbert Oberteuffer, Man In Function, Man In Total (Columbus, 1966), "Part 1"; all these authors, however, do point out the holistic approach to physical activity during the Golden Age of Greece.

[3]Peter McIntosh, Physical Education in England (London, 1968), 32; see also Celeste Ulrich, The Social Matrix of Physical Education (Englewood Cliffs, 1968), 118ff.

[4]Charles A. Bucher, Foundations of Physical Education (St. Louis, 1968), 331.

[5]Chalmer G. Hixson, The Administration of Interscholastic Athletics (New York, 1967), 3ff; Frederick Rand Rogers, The Future of Interscholastic Athletics (New York, 1929), 10ff.

[6]Hixson, 11ff. Leonard Larson, "Why Sports Participation," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXV (January, 1964), 36-38 traces this view to the present day. In 1918, the National Educational Association set forth the "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education" which emphasized the democratic values of participation in physical activity and advocated their integration into the total environment.

[7]In his comparative study of physical activity in England and the United States, Howard Savage makes this point quite explicit; Howard Savage, Games and Sports in British Schools and Universities (New York, 1927), 36ff.

[8]McIntosh, 60ff; see also John Behee, Fielding Yost's Legacy (Ann Arbor, 1971) for an enlightening study of the emergence of the coach as an institutional person during this era.

[9]Howard Savage authored several of the Carnegie Reports including American College Athletics (New York, 1929) and Current Developments in American College Sport (New York, 1931). For an examination of the retrenchment in the women's areas see Marguerite Schwarz, "The Athletic Federation of College Women," Journal of Health and Physical Education, VII (May 1936), 345-346 and Mabel Lee, "The Case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and the Situation Since 1923," Research Quarterly, II (May 1931), 93. A general overview of the problem is given in Arthur Weston, The Making of American Physical Education (New York, 1962), 83-87 and 278-281. Frederick Rand Rogers, The Amateur Spirit in Scholastic Games and Sports (Albany, 1929), 101ff.

[10]Richard Swanson, "History of Physical Education in the Detroit Public Schools," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Wayne State University, 1964), 94; also the Detroit Board of Education, Annual Report of the Board of Education (Detroit, 1915ff) yields a continuous summary.

[11]Detroit Board of Education, Annual Report of the Board of Education for the Year Ending June 30, 1922 (Detroit, 1922), 46ff; also see Swanson's "History . . . ," 95 for a detailed delineation of that early development.

[12]Swanson, 59.

[13]See below 30-32 and 41.

[14]The Detroit News, February 1929, 8.

[15]The Detroit News, May 26, 1954, 14; Blanchard reached the pinnacle of athletic prominence through track, a sport which required individual initiative rather than a team or coach prompted initiative. Although no one has developed the thesis, it seems evident that many of the reformers of athletics have participated in such individual sports such as track rather than football or basketball; cf. Jack Scott, The Athletic Revolution (New York, 1971).

[16]The Detroit News, June 20, 1946, 16.

[17]"1935 Honor Award Fellows," Journal of Health and Physical Education, VI (November, 1935), 24.

[18]The Detroit News, May 26, 1954, 14.

[19]The Detroit News, December 1, 1969, D. 7.

[20]The Detroit News, February 17, 1929, 8.

[21]Detroit Free Press, January 10, 1929.

[22]The period between 1930 and 1935 was the most productive for Blanchard as he produced fifteen published articles during that time span.

[23]"Deans Make Blanchard Health Education Chief," The Detroit Collegian, October 11, 1933, 1; the Detroit Board of Education operated Wayne University during this period. The promotion, though real, appears to have served as a money saving maneuver by the Board since the system was in desperate financial difficulty during the Depression. Cf. Swanson, 88.

[24]"1935 Honor . . .," 24.

[25]The Detroit News, June 20, 1946, 16.

[26]The Detroit News, July 7, 1954, 26.

[27]Detroit Free Press, June 14, 1931, 4.

[28]Swanson, 94.

[29]The Detroit News, September 1, 1929, 4.

[30]Evidently Richard Swanson in the work previously cited felt that Loren Post as Blanchard's superior deserved credit. Yet, contemporary sources are quite explicit that Blanchard himself developed and proposed the project in Detroit; cf. The Detroit News, February 17, 1929; Walter Draper, "Intraschool Versus Interschool Athletics" (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Detroit, 1931, Appendix A, np.; also see below 41.)

[31]"Regulations Relative to the Non-Coaching Rule," Metropolitan High and Intermediate Schools Athletic Manual, 1929-1930 (Detroit, 1930), 23.

[32]Frederick Rand Rogers, "State Championships Abolished," American Physical Education Review, XXXIV (February 1929), 133.

[33]Draper, op. cit.

[34]"1935 Honor . . .," 24; Rogers, "State Championships . . .," 132.

[35]"Rules Adopted by the State Basketball Committee for the Administration of General Regulation N. 1," Physical Education Bulletin, IX (January 1928), 7; "Dr. Frederick Rand Rogers Resigns," New York State Education, XVIII (June 1931), 983.

[36]"1935 Honor . . .," 28; the early periods of their administrative careers are strangely parallel. Rogers: 1926-1928, Chief of Physical Education Bureau in New York State; 1928-1931, Director of Health and Physical Education, New York State Education Department; 1931-1935, Dean of Student Health and Physical Education in Boston University. Blanchard: 1926-1929, Supervisor of Athletics, Detroit City Schools; 1929-1933, Director of Health Education, Detroit City Schools; 1933-1945, the duties of Director of Athletics, Wayne University, added to Supervisory position.

[37]Personal interview, Sam Bishop, November 26, 1971; personal interview, Ken Bortle, November 26, 1971; personal interview, Seymour Brown, December 28, 1971; personal interview, George Meade, November 22, 1971. These coaches and officials who were active during that era asserted that the non-coaching program was completely Blanchard's idea.

[38]The first official notation of the program occurred in the Metropolitan Detroit High and Intermediate Schools Athletic Manual, 1928-1929 (Detroit, 1928), 22 one year after it had been in force; personal interviews listed in note 41.

[39]Personal interview, Sam Bishop. The Northwestern High School team which Mr. Bishop coached participated in that experiment.

[40]See below 41.

[41]There is no record in the Board of Education Minutes of such a proposal ever coming before the Board, although according to Dr. Robert Luby, the present Supervisor of Health Education for the Detroit Schools, that situation was normal since matters of this nature were usually managed on a departmental level.

[42]Cf. The Detroit News, January 1, 1928, 4; March 10, 1928, 10.

[43]Personal interview, George Meade; Meade served as an assistant to Blanchard during this period.

[44]The Detroit News, January 1, 1928, 4; March 10, 1928, 10.

[45]The Detroit News, March 10, 1928, 10.

[46]Detroit Board of Education, Annual Report of the Board of Education for the Year Ending June 30, 1928 (Detroit, 1928), 46.

[47]The coaches who were interviewed felt that the non-coaching rule in regard to football was more difficult to live with than in basketball since in the former sport there were more players and a multiplicity of plays and stratagems.

[48]The Detroit News, January 1, 1929, 21; The Detroit News, March 17, 1929, 29.

[49]Vaughn Blanchard, "The Argument For a Continuance of Detroit's Newly Adopted Policy of Non-Adult Interference at Athletic Contests," American Physical Education Review, XXXIV (January 1929), 45; Seymour Brown, a coach and athletic director at Northeastern High School during the Blanchard administration, indicates that there was a distinct division between Blanchard who was regarded as an Eastern outsider and most other coaches who were local graduates of Michigan Normal; personal interview, Seymour Brown, December 28, 1971.

[50]The Detroit News, January 25, 1931, 4,2.

[51]Of the persons interviewed for this paper, all were in agreement that no coaches supported the project. Moreover, the coaches themselves indicated that they found it rather easy and expedient to cheat on the system through the use of auxiliary captains. Although the regulations had stipulated that all members of a squad should be playing members, most coaches used a non-playing student manager to relay their wishes through pre-determined signals during the game.

[52]The Detroit News, May 10, 1931, 3.

[53]Blanchard, "The Argument . . .," 45.

[54]The Detroit News, May 11, 1931, 21.

[55]The Detroit News, May 13, 25; Proceedings of the Board of Education, Detroit, 1930-1931 (May 12, 1931), 721.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Detroit Free Press, May 13, 1931, 2, 9.

[58]See Vaughn Blanchard and L.B. Collins, Modern Physical Education Programs for Boys and Girls (New York, 1940) and Vaughn Blanchard, "Hallmarks of Democracy in Health and Physical Education," Ohio Schools (February 1941) for examples of how he felt the teacher must turn part of the educational enterprise over to the students; also see Randall D. Warden, "By Way of Disputing the Value of Present Trends in Physical Education," Mind and Body, XXXX (September-October, 1933), 109ff. for a representative opinion of one who disagreed with Blanchard's ideas on progressive education in physical education.

Bibliographic Essay

A considerable amount of biographical information regarding Vaughn Blanchard is contained in various news items and biographical sketches found in The Detroit News and the Detroit Free Press. Yet, the researcher has been unable to discover any significant core of his personal papers. No correspondence or notations from his office at the Detroit Public Schools are in existence. Nevertheless, the tremendous amount of written articles which he produced during the period of this study does reveal, to some degree, the public aspects of his life. For a general survey of his educational philosophy see Vaughn Blanchard, Health, Physical Education and Athletics (The Board of Education of the City of Detroit, 1954) and Vaughn Blanchard and L. B. Collins, A Modern Physical Education Program for Boys and Girls (New York, 1940).

For a more particular example of his views during this period see Vaughn Blanchard, "Guiding Principles in Teacher Training," American Physical Education Research Quarterly, III (May 1932), 81, in which he argues that the teacher training college must produce physical educators and not coaches. His view that athletics are an integral part of education is expressed in "Athletic Competition Suggestion," American Physical Education Review, XXXIII (May 1928), 340. Three revealing articles appeared in 1931 in the Detroit Educational Bulletin: "The Minor Sport Takes Its Place With the Major Sport," XIV (February 1931), 7; "Intraschool and Interschool Athletics," XIV (March 1931), 7; "Sportsmanship," XIV (April 1931), 11. Of primary importance to this paper is his useful article "The Argument for a Continuance of Detroit's Newly Adopted Policy of Non-Adult Interference at Athletic Contests," American Physical Education Review, XXXIV (January 1929), 42. With regard to the non-coaching rule, personal interviews with the following coaches and officials who were prominent during that era were revealing: Sam Bishop, George Meade, Ken Bortle and Seymour Brown.

A firm perception of the operation of athletics and physical education within the city school system is readily obtained from the Athletic Manuals

published by the department each year. The relationship of athletics to the total educational picture can be obtained in the various Annual Reports of the Board of Education, as well as by the monograph written by Blanchard cited previously. Although erroneous when analyzing the non-coaching program, Richard Swanson, "History of Physical Education in the Detroit Public Schools" (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Wayne State University, 1964) is helpful in providing an overview of the program of that particular school system.

The work and perspective of Frederick Rand Rogers is portrayed in "1935 Honor Award Fellows," Journal of Health and Physical Education, VI (November 1935), 24; a more detailed account of his views during that era is contained in his contemporary monographs of 1929. The Amateur Spirit In Scholastic Games and Sports (Albany, 1929) expresses Rogers' version of placing the "game back into the hands of the players," while The Future of Interscholastic Athletics (New York, 1929) is an attempt to point out the pitfalls and possibilities of interscholastic athletics. Furthermore, when researching any aspect of athletics during the period described in this paper any of the Carnegie Foundation Studies by Howard Savage are useful. Especially relevant are American College Athletics (New York, 1929) and Current Developments in American College Sport (New York, 1931). Although the focus in Savage's work is upon college athletics, his indictment covers all sports programs.

Numerous general works in the field have some value in providing background information. The most helpful of these are Chalmer G. Hixson, The Administration of Interscholastic Athletics (New York, 1967) and Deobold Van Dalen and Bruce Bennett, World History of Physical Education (Englewood Cliffs, 1971). Arthur Weston, The Making of American Physical Education (New York, 1962) points to numerous source materials as does Ellen Gerber, Innovators and Institutions in Physical Education (Philadelphia, 1971). Most other general works, however, are of little value for specific reference.